

obtain by transfer the Nez Perce artifacts in the Yosemite collection, where they had no pertinence. Later such cooperation between parks would constitute an element of strength in an integrated chain of museums. The Mammoth project also stimulated Russell's enthusiasm for fur trade history; here was an opportunity to include the subject in needed exhibits.⁴⁴

Work proceeded meanwhile on two other aspects of the museum program. Herb Maier started construction of a fourth branch museum located at Fishing Bridge on the shore of Yellowstone Lake. He also had the first of the trailside shrine structures, at Obsidian Cliff, ready to receive its cases. Russell got a good start on the Fishing Bridge exhibit plan. More surprisingly, he managed to find time for curatorial activities beyond the immediate demands of the exhibits, something that normally received low priority. Both the Park Service and the AAM committee thought of park museum collections as educational tools justified by their interpretive function. It would be many years before collection care and management received significant emphasis. Russell's work that summer nevertheless demonstrated a firm grasp of acquisition methods and a lively, knowledgeable concern for study collections.⁴⁵

Museum development in Yellowstone proceeded at an undiminished rate during the 1931 season in spite of the worsening Great Depression. Bumpus supervised the work personally for almost a month, with the exhibit staff operating out of a tent camp set up near the Fishing Bridge Museum. Russell concentrated on the bird room for Fishing Bridge, while Erwin Raisz worked on the geology room. Opened in early August, the two rooms exemplified quite different approaches.⁴⁶

A wealth of mounted birds provided the core of the bird room. In step with the best current practice Russell arranged the specimens interpretively, many of them in semi-habitat settings to bring out ecological relationships. He supplemented these displays with "related story" units on other aspects of bird biology. For the geology room Dr. and Mrs. Raisz produced a sequence of graphic panels containing diagrammatic illustrations and text. The panels told a story with outstanding clarity and interest. The relatively few specimens in the room played a secondary role because the real objects pertinent to the narrative were geologic features visitors would see out in the park. In this regard the room embodied the essence of park museum philosophy: to interpret the significant aspects and to consider the park itself as the museum.

On the other hand, such predominance of graphics over specimens could go too far and often did during the ensuing decade. This resulted especially because many of the new museums addressed historical subject matter and cultural objects had not established legitimacy as conveyors of historical data. No one quite knew how to use them in interpretive exhibits. Getting historians to appreciate objects became a continuing concern to

Russell.⁴⁷ Meanwhile the verbal, "flatwork" exhibits in Park Service museums earned the kindly censure of the leading American museum critic.⁴⁸

The Fishing Bridge Museum still lacked the exhibits for one main room when the 1931 season ended. Nevertheless, the AAM Yellowstone project was nearing successful completion. Already there were signs that it had hit its target. Congress had appropriated funds for a small museum in Rocky Mountain National Park as well as for the Sinnott Memorial at Crater Lake. Rocky Mountain superintendent Edmund B. Rogers and his park naturalist Dorr Yeager, who had transferred from Yellowstone, persuaded the Denver Museum of Natural History to provide specimens and the well-known taxidermy firm of Jonas Brothers to make them up into small habitat groups as a donation.⁴⁹

The American Association of Museums invited Russell to speak on park museums and the Yellowstone project at a general session of its 1933 annual meeting in Chicago. During the meeting the Committee on Outdoor Education also convened. Bumpus submitted his resignation, whereupon Chauneey Hamlin reorganized the committee keeping Bumpus as a member but replacing most of the others with younger men. His action kept the committee alive, but its role on behalf of the Park Service was substantially at an end.

Russell went to Yellowstone after the meeting and conducted Laurence Vail Coleman, the AAM director, on an inspection of the committee's five years of accomplishment under its final Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial grant. While appreciating and making good use of the museums and wayside exhibits produced, the park greeted with relief the termination of what must often have seemed outside interference. Superintendent Roger W. Toll avoided meeting Coleman during his several days in the park, and Russell reported that "the feeling against Bumpus and A.A.M. is general here."⁵⁰ Despite this sour note, fruitful collaboration between the organizations continued.

Park Museums and the Field Division of Education

In the decade 1925-35 two ideas on the management of the Park Service museum program underlay its continuing growth. Chief Naturalist Ansel Hall conceived of himself as the leader in park museum work and the educational division, as his operation was called, as its natural center. Hermon Bumpus, on the other hand, concluded that the museum program needed to be centered at the Service's Washington headquarters where authority for policy-making and budgeting rested. It was Carl Russell's sometimes uncomfortable situation to work with a foot in both camps.

It will be recalled that Hall received his appointment as chief naturalist of the National Park Service in 1923 but postponed entering on duty to accompany Chauncey Hamlin's son in his *Wanderjahr*. Work on the new Yosemite Museum further delayed his assumption of the position. While Hall was on the AAM payroll as executive agent for the Yosemite Museum project, he looked ahead to his role as chief naturalist. Director Mather had given him permission to set up headquarters in Berkeley, and he purchased land near the University of California campus and began constructing the quarters he expected to need. Besides a house to live in he proceeded with a facility for museum exhibit production. It would provide 2,316 square feet of space for an office big enough to house a technical museum library, a studio/shop for the messier stages of exhibit preparation, metalworking and carpenter shops for building cases and other display fabrication, a larger studio in which to do the final artwork and assembly, a photographic darkroom, and a combined garage/storeroom.⁵¹ All but the studio were partially completed during the winter of 1924-25. When the AAM abruptly terminated his assignment as executive agent, he assumed the duties of chief naturalist in June 1925. The new building in Berkeley became his headquarters, for which the Park Service paid him rent.⁵²

The next year Hall built two geyser models for Yellowstone that spewed water about once a minute to a height of thirty inches. His hands-on involvement in exhibit preparation, which he probably enjoyed, continued to some extent but not as his primary activity. His educational division had important tasks in interpretive planning, coordination, and training. His intent regarding park museum work at this stage shows in his proposed organization. As an assistant he wanted "an expert museum technologist who has had long experience in the preparing of all types of exhibits for display, in the preservation of material, and in the construction of models, groups, and museum equipment."⁵³ This versatile and highly skilled preparator would spend the winters at headquarters supervising and training park naturalists brought in during the off-season as they helped him build exhibits for their parks. In summer he would go out to install these exhibits and continue training the naturalists in museum preparation.

Such a program would have reinforced the natural inclination of many park interpreters to act as their own exhibit specialists. It thus would have encouraged the existing amateurism, although upgrading the results in the case of apt pupils. Hall did not obtain anyone to help with the museum work until 1929, however, when Carl Russell became field naturalist-museum advisor. Russell brought a somewhat different orientation bolstered by his continuing experience under Hermon Bumpus. His influence would lead toward making park interpreters discriminating clients rather than practitioners in the technology of museum exhibition. Some tension between the two approaches would linger, and occasionally flare up, long after

centralized exhibit design and production became established Service policy.

Delay in staffing was not the only snag Hall's new division encountered. Fiscal watchdogs did not take long to spot the conflict of interest in Hall's position as both landlord and tenant. The Service was forced to terminate the arrangement, and only strong support from the directorate saved Hall from having to refund the rent received for the building he had provided.⁵⁴ It took time to find another suitable place for his office and workshops, during which he worked out of the Service's existing field offices in San Francisco. Early in 1929 the educational division moved to rooms offered rent-free by the University of California in Hilgard Hall, centrally located on the Berkeley campus. This academic building remained its base until World War II. At first the available space did not allow for much, if any, shop work, but by 1931 the division had nine rooms. In 1933 growing needs, and apparently objections to the noise and dirt accompanying exhibit production, led to moving the Park Service activities to a more isolated location, the entire top floor of one wing.⁵⁵

Director Albright approved a "General Plan of Administration for the Educational Division of the National Park Service" on June 4, 1929.⁵⁶ Under this plan, undoubtedly drafted by Hall, the educational division comprised not only the headquarters in Berkeley but all the interpreters in the parks. The plan delegated to the chief naturalist considerable control over the selection of park interpretive personnel and over each park's "Plan of Administration of Educational Activities." The latter detailed the organization and operation of a park's current interpretive program. Any changes in it were to go through the chief naturalist to the director for approval. The educational headquarters would develop or approve all plans for museum buildings, equipment, collections, and exhibits. Park naturalists might carry out these plans with the advice and assistance of the chief naturalist or other technical advisors. The general plan spelled out the objectives and scope of park museums, briefly stated accession policies, and outlined the park interpreter's role in administering a museum.

Approval of this comprehensive document set the stage for the First Park Naturalists' Training Conference, organized by Chief Naturalist Hall. It was held at the Berkeley headquarters and lasted four weeks in November and December 1929, ending with a field trip to Yosemite. The trainees comprised all six of the full-time park naturalists and one superintendent's assistant, seven able and experienced interpreters from big, busy parks with museums in operation or prospect. Four days dealt with museum matters. Carl Russell began each of the museum sessions with a theme-setting paper. The trainees followed with papers on assigned topics interspersed with lively debates on the ideas expressed. Russell read aloud the brief chapter on the purpose of museums from Laurence Vail Coleman's *Manual for*

Small Museums, and most of the conference papers and recommendations drew to some extent from the same well-chosen source.⁵⁷

The conference proceedings demonstrate more specifically the concepts then characteristic of park museum work. The participants agreed, as a matter of course by then, that a national park is itself a museum, its features the prime specimens to be preserved and interpreted. This made the park museum an integral part of a larger enterprise, a cog in the wheel of the total preservation-interpretation effort. The potential disparity between a museum's fundamental objectivity and the parks' developing mission to promote an environmental ethic, creating a subtle line between the use of exhibits to interpret and persuade, did not surface. The conferees saw that a park museum differs from other museums principally in its limited scope, being concerned only with what makes the park significant.

From their point of view parks needed two kinds of museums. One, the headquarters museum, introduced visitors to the park as a whole while providing a base of operations for the interpretive staff. The other kind was a smaller satellite located at a strategic point for interpreting a key aspect in greater detail. They called this type a trailside, branch, or focal point museum and usually included observation stations in the definition. Such a scheme of central and branch museums fitted the perceived needs of the big parks represented at the conference but would not prove viable Service-wide. The discussions affirmed that exhibits must both communicate understanding of park features and motivate visitors to experience them firsthand, that the exhibits should tell a sequential story, and that exhibit installation should aim toward high standards in design and construction.

It was further agreed that park museums should have study collections for reference and research. An admonition to the naturalists to program time for work on the study collections implies that it was already hard to fit curatorial duties into busy schedules. Hall advocated collecting archeological, ethnological, and historical artifacts ahead of natural history specimens, a practice inconsistent with the primary significance of natural parks and more often involving donations with conditions attached. The conference affirmed that park museums require complete, systematic, permanent records, although in discussing these the trainees failed to grasp adequately Coleman's careful analysis.

It seemed clear that in administering a park museum the permanent park interpreter would act as director, assigning curatorial duties to members of his staff. As de facto museum directors and curators the trainees noted their responsibilities under the American Association of Museums' published code of ethics. They also endorsed the idea that park museums should cooperate as fully as possible with other museums both within and outside the parks, a point stressed in Coleman's book. Finally, the conferees considered how the parks and Field Educational Headquarters should

collaborate in museum development but did not define the nascent relationships clearly.

Russell's appointment as field naturalist-museum advisor four months before the conference constituted an important potential factor in this collaboration that remained to be tested. Hermon Bumpus and Yellowstone left him little time at first to advise and assist other parks. After the training conference his next chance came in August 1930. He slipped away from Yellowstone for a Sunday visit to Grand Teton National Park. There he found in the seasonally employed park naturalist, Fritiof M. Fryxell, a kindred spirit and promising resource. Fryxell, geology professor and museum curator at Augustana College, had a lively and informed interest in developing a park museum. His dedication to science and teaching combined with curatorial interests extending to historical matters would benefit the Park Service museum program in the future.⁵⁸

Russell's second advisory involvement in the field came in November 1930. He went from Yellowstone to Rocky Mountain National Park to review briefly the superintendent's plans for a small museum to be built with appropriated funds. When the museum was nearly completed the following August, he returned to Rocky Mountain for a week to inspect the work, offer suggestions, and prepare a report. A few months later, en route from Yellowstone to Berkeley, he stopped three days at Mount Rainier to consult on the park's proposed museum plans. He found them promising and noted that he could usefully discuss the suggested building layouts with the Service architects stationed in San Francisco.⁵⁹ Back in Berkeley he occupied for the first time an office of his own in Hilgard Hall, becoming a visible part of the field headquarters organization.

The field trip Russell made to the Southwestern National Monuments in March 1932 explored more fully the service a museum advisor could render. At Casa Grande he dealt with an established museum grounded in Frank Pinkley's distinctive philosophy. It was about to move into a new building with more space, and he evidently succeeded in persuading Pinkley to accept some provisions for self-guidance. He was soon busy lettering labels and making charts to supplement the exhibited artifacts. A brief visit to Tumacacori with Pinkley and Robert Rose, the new park naturalist for the Southwestern Monuments, introduced him to a site rich in potential for museum development. He and Rose then went to Petrified Forest to prepare from scratch a small museum for the new headquarters. With local help they accomplished as much as time permitted, leaving some exhibits for Russell to work on in Berkeley during the winter. In the spring of 1933 he did some additional exhibit work at Casa Grande and Petrified Forest and traveled with Rose to become better acquainted with museum needs in several more of the monuments.⁶⁰



Homemade exhibit at Aztec Ruins National Monument, 1933. Photographed by Carl Russell.

Russell made a short advisory visit to Glacier National Park during the 1932 Yellowstone season and another in 1933. These did not achieve much. The park's rather grandiose museum proposals failed to materialize, and the park naturalist aimed to keep the reins with a minimum of input from educational headquarters.⁶¹ In a sense the field naturalist-museum advisor approach to museum development reached the apex of its effectiveness in Russell's 1932 and 1933 assignments to the Southwestern Monuments. By the time he was free to devote his full attention to this approach, external events would force a change.

Meanwhile, Hall resumed active participation in exhibit planning and production. In 1930 John Merriam called on him to carry out some of the assembling of materials and installation of exhibits for the Yavapai Museum at Grand Canyon. This collaboration produced good results, and Hall continued to assist Merriam with exhibits for the Sinnott Memorial observation station at Crater Lake in 1931. That year seems to have clarified his mandate as senior park naturalist to supervise "museum construction and installation of exhibits."⁶²

In 1932 the Park Service decided to take an active part in the Century of Progress Exposition, scheduled to open the next year at Chicago. Hall got the assignment to build most of the park exhibits for the fair. He used the limited facilities in Hilgard Hall, with Russell and most of the park naturalists as preparation staff, to produce a series of miniature models

illustrating features of several parks and monuments. This rather makeshift crew planned and constructed the displays in about three months and shipped them off to Chicago by mid-April 1933.⁶³

While they labored on this project, Congress enacted President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first emergency relief program. Called Emergency Conservation Work, it provided for quick mobilization of unemployed young men as a Civilian Conservation Corps. The first six-month enrollment period began April 1. Within a few weeks the Park Service had responsibility for some 30,000 men in 175 camps. Because planning and supervising their work projects required far more manpower than it possessed, the President agreed to hiring temporary employees for this purpose outside normal civil service procedures. Soon the Service had about 2,300 ECW technicians, some of whom later became key members of its permanent organization.⁶⁴

Assistant Director Conrad L. Wirth, placed in charge of the CCC program for state parks, divided his huge administrative task into districts, a decision that foreshadowed the regionalization of the Park Service. He promptly selected Herbert Maier to manage the large Rocky Mountain District. Maier remained an able Service administrator for the rest of his career, but the museum program lost direct access to his outstanding talents as a museum architect and preparator.

Wirth located one of the new CCC camps for the second enrollment period in Strawberry Canyon, just above the Berkeley campus. This placed a reservoir of unspecialized manpower at the doorstep of the Field Educational Division. The camp remained for only six months, but Hall obtained several enrollees for exhibit construction, and the demonstration of useful work opportunities led the ECW administrators to station a 35-man detachment at the abandoned camp facility. By the time the new enrollees were available, the Branch of Research and Education in Washington had in operation a topographic model shop at Fort Hunt, Virginia. CCC boys from the Fort Hunt camp manned the project under ECW technicians. The Berkeley detachment followed the Fort Hunt example, specializing in relief maps that involved labor-intensive methods and were still very popular as interpretive devices. Some of the Berkeley enrollees worked on other kinds of exhibits and a few became accomplished preparators. The employment of CCC labor in Hall's division justified having ECW technicians there as well, and in due course seven positions were allotted him.⁶⁵

By the fall of 1933 the Service knew it would receive Public Works Administration funds to build a number of structures housing museums, although the details were not yet clear. Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, who served also as PWA administrator, approved projects to construct combined headquarters/museum buildings for six of the new

historical parks in the East and for five smaller park areas west of the Mississippi.⁶⁶ PWA also funded conversion of the Moraine Park Lodge in Rocky Mountain National Park to museum use, an addition to the Mesa Verde museum, and the reconstruction of historic buildings in Yorktown providing museum space for Colonial National Monument. In addition, Ickes included a departmental museum in the plans for a new PWA-funded Interior Department building in Washington. PWA thus supplied the principal focus and support for the Service's museum program during the next few years. Most of the western projects became urgent problems for Hall's staff at Berkeley.

The Civil Works Administration allotted nearly \$2.5 million to the Park Service for expenditure between November 1933 and April 1934. Hall's office received enough of the money to employ 56 selected workers whose skills could be adapted to exhibit preparation or support services. By August 1934 the State Emergency Relief Administration began to supply workers, most lacking special training for the tasks involved. Their numbers grew, reaching a daily average of 150 within a few months. To these were added some University of California students hired part-time with Federal Emergency Relief Administration funds. The sheer number of workers required more space, so the field division set up additional laboratories in suitable buildings near the campus. To cope with the influx of untrained employees the Emergency Educational Program furnished instructors who not only taught craft skills but also produced illustrations and sculptures for use in park exhibits. The cumulative impact of ECW, PWA, CWA, SERA, FERA, and EEP challenged the administrative capabilities of Hall's division, as Depression programs did other Park Service units.⁶⁷

The rising tide reached the Field Division of Education in November 1933. A few weeks earlier Carl Russell was hoping for a modest increase in personnel to help him handle museum work the parks were requesting. He proposed adding a curator, two taxidermists, a modelmaker/sculptor, and a draftsman/artist. Now he found his regular duties interrupted to prepare justifications for a vastly enlarged staff. In collaboration with Hall he had to plan its organization and survey the projects it should undertake. Most of December and January were spent getting the Civil Works people interviewed and assigned to jobs and supervising the new workers as they began exhibit preparation or data gathering. By December some of the new ECW technicians became available to help.⁶⁸ Two of them, Louis Schellbach and Arthur Woodward, were curators of professional caliber with whom Russell had shared research interests.

Russell's previous work at Yosemite and Yellowstone and in the Southwestern Monuments had taught him to plan thoroughly in advance of museum development. Before the burgeoning laboratories could produce



Field Division of Education, 1933. Technical staff in office at Hilgard Hall: (left to right) Louis Schellbach, Carl Russell, Ansel Hall, Arthur Woodward.

exhibits of acceptable quality, the museum planners and preparators would need much reliable data. ECW technicians, particularly Ralph L. Beal, and selected CWA workers promptly began the compilation of what would become an impressive number of background research reports drawn largely from published sources. Less specialized workers mimeographed and bound the reports for wider distribution. Over the years, also, Russell had spent much of his "leisure" amassing information on the western fur trade and park history and producing a definitive bibliography of scientific research conducted at Yellowstone. Not surprisingly, therefore, the CWA applicants he recommended included some librarians and experienced bibliographers. They began a massive annotated general bibliography of the national parks and monuments as well as projects for individual parks.

Russell's previous immersion in museum planning also doubtless contributed to a fresh formalization of that process. The Service had to construct several new museums without delay, and it had a large emergency staff of preparators ready to build exhibits. Both required well-conceived plans and precise specifications. A new Museum Development Plan was prescribed, closely linked with the evolving Master Plan concept.⁶⁹ The Field Division of Education and the Branch of Plans and Design were to collaborate in the preparation of this document, intended to fit museum functions and facilities into a park's total plan. The park superintendent would begin by defining the museum problem and proposing the facilities

needed. After approval of the development plan he would present his tentative requirements for the proposed museum building. The Field Division would review and refine these, in continued consultation with the park, and Plans and Design would prepare construction drawings and specifications. The Field Division of Education stood ready to help the park prepare and install the exhibits, but the procedure as laid down left responsibility for exhibit planning unassigned. During 1934 the burden of this step fell largely on Russell and Schellbach.

Because they could not keep pace with so many preparators, some minor chaos was unavoidable. Hall felt that every park could use a topographic model of its territory. With the Fort Hunt laboratory busy along the same line, the Berkeley shop produced a large relief map of Mount Desert Island, Maine, and shipped four heavy casts of it across the continent to Acadia National Park. Acadia unfortunately had no place to use even one of them. The Field Division also produced a large relief model of the area immediately east of San Francisco Bay, which had no direct usefulness in the interpretation of any national park. Questionably justified as an experiment to help train the map modelers and painters, it was displayed locally and probably represented an effort to publicize the operation.

Other measures to take up the slack had more utility. An assembly line began copying, hand coloring, and binding hundreds of lantern slides for use by park naturalists, although the diversion of the photographer to take innumerable promotional pictures of laboratory activities delayed production. Less skilled workers made wire tripods in assorted sizes to support round-bottomed Indian pots, many of which were likely to be exhibited in the new museums. Other workers stamped out thousands of metal nature trail labels.

In the midst of getting plans and production into full swing, Hall and Russell were summoned to Washington where the Educational Advisory Board was scheduled to consider museum matters. Russell left Berkeley in mid-February 1934 with instructions to visit en route several of the eastern parks proposed for new PWA museums. Vicksburg proved surprisingly attractive. "It would not be an unpleasant job to supervise preparation and installation of materials if a staff of preparators could be made available," he wrote his wife, envisioning the sort of field work he had done in the Southwest with laboratory support such as was developing in Berkeley. He noted that the three enthusiastic ECW historical technicians at Vicksburg had secured CWA workers to help with research but lacked any museum experience. Its absence showed in the "little tacky museum" they had assembled as a start.⁷⁰

Russell reached Washington on Friday, February 23, in time to spend the afternoon at Park Service headquarters. Reporting to the Branch of

Research and Education proved a deflating experience. Its chief, Assistant Director Harold C. Bryant, was noncommittal. He implied that the Washington office had been considering Russell for the museum program in eastern parks but doubted his executive ability. Verne Chatelain, the chief historian on Bryant's small staff who was pursuing a vigorous program with increasing independence, made it clear that he wanted Ansel Hall to have no connection with the eastern museums. He would accept Russell's assistance but made no definite offer.⁷¹

The Educational Advisory Board met Monday morning. Museums did not come up for discussion until late afternoon, by which time most of the board members had slipped away. Hermon Bumpus and Waldo G. Leland remained along with several Service officials. Hall made a half-hour presentation, which seemed to his coworker from Berkeley particularly egocentric. Russell himself put one cogent question to Director Arno B. Cammerer: How would the development of museums in the new PWA buildings be financed? Apparently no one had thought to provide funding for more than the structures. CWA money, which was paying preparators in Berkeley, would soon terminate.

At the end of the day Russell turned to Bumpus in discouragement. They walked together the few blocks to the Cosmos Club on Lafayette Square, where Bumpus had a dinner appointment. In those few minutes he asked Russell what he wanted in regard to the museum program. "I told him that I wanted a Div[ision] of Mus[eums] and the place in it of Chief," Russell wrote his wife. "He replied that that was clearly impossible because of Ansel and that I should tell him of a second choice. Of course I told him that I'd like an Eastern office, preferably in charge of museum plans with particular responsibilities connected with Eastern Historical Parks." Bumpus assured him that this proposal matched his own ideas, despite Hall's opposition to splitting the museum work between East and West, and advised him to seek Leland's support.⁷² Waldo Gifford Leland, director of the American Council of Learned Societies and successor to John Merriam on the Educational Advisory Board, stood in relation to Park Service historical programs much as Bumpus did toward park museums and interpretation.

The question of museum financing Russell had raised prompted the director's staff to ask the Public Works Administration to include furnishings in the museum building allotments. Furnishings necessarily implied exhibit planning, preparation, and installation. Bryant set Hall and Russell to drafting estimates and justifications for submission to PWA. The assignment took them the rest of the week, with Russell feeling he had done most of the work.⁷³

On Saturday night Bryant invited his two assistants along with Hall and Russell to dinner at his home. The five men met at a time when rapid New

Deal changes seemed to intensify the normal rivalries, animosities, and aggrandizing maneuvers of the bureaucracy. The discussions did not spare sensibilities. They established beyond question that Hall and Russell were on opposite sides and that Russell could not expect from Hall or Bryant independence in the Field Division of Education. Verne Chatelain declared for an eastern office of museums that he himself would supervise. He would take either Hall or Russell, but one of them should move east. Earl Trager, Bryant's other assistant, had his Fort Hunt laboratories to defend. Under pressure Russell cautiously stated his interest in the eastern museum position "if conditions would warrant the change." At the end of the evening that appeared to be the direction matters would take.⁷⁴

The following Monday Russell conferred briefly with Director Cammerer and his associates regarding the proposed move. Without a position established or funded, the only immediate prospect seemed to rest on finding expense money to support him in the East on detail. From this meeting he concluded that Associate Director Arthur E. Demaray and Conrad Wirth were the only men in Washington who really cared about his transfer and that Demaray, if anyone, would know how to effect it. The same day Bryant informed the director that he proposed assigning Russell to Fort Hunt in charge of an eastern section of Hall's field headquarters, "making a museum planner available near at hand so Chatelain can supervise the development plans."⁷⁵ Such an arrangement would leave him little chance for independent action.

The next day Bryant drove Chatelain, Hall, and Russell to Morristown National Historical Park, site of the biggest eastern PWA museum project. Chatelain concurred with Russell that Lafayette Hall, an available building adjacent to the Ford House in the park, would provide better facilities for a museum preparation laboratory than Fort Hunt. Besides, Morristown's proximity to the pool of unemployed artists in New York City outweighed Fort Hunt's convenient nearness to the director's office in Washington. They anticipated difficulty in convincing Bryant and Trager of these advantages, but Russell was ready to concede the existing relief model shop at Fort Hunt to Trager's control. When the others returned to Washington, Russell remained behind to lay the groundwork for an eastern museum operation.

He spent a day at the American Museum of Natural History in New York and met with James L. Clark, the man in charge of producing its widely acclaimed exhibits. Clark discussed optimistically the recruitment of preparators and offered his help in selecting qualified people. Probably at his suggestion, Russell stayed over to interview a man recommended as head of the proposed laboratory. After a long discussion Russell rightly concluded that in Ned J. Burns, chief of preparation at the Museum of the City of New York, he had found a valuable asset.⁷⁶

This significant encounter occurred on March 9, 1934. The following day, after mailing Bryant a proposed staffing outline, Russell took the train back to Berkeley. He probably anticipated an early return, but eastern museum matters lay largely dormant for the next nine months while the necessary papers made their slow way through official channels. The remainder of 1934 found Russell hard at work on western museum projects in Berkeley and in the field. Scotts Bluff National Monument and the Moraine Park museum at Rocky Mountain National Park, both fur trade stories, demanded most of his time, but at least twenty other parks called for his attention. He labored at museum development plans, exhibit layouts and specifications, data gathering, supervision of artists, and administrative chores.

Finally, in mid-December, the Service received approval to transfer \$65,000 from other PWA projects "to purchase and install equipment in various museum buildings which have been, or are being, constructed by this Service under the Public Works Program" ⁷⁷ This sum enabled allotments for 13 museums, eight of them in eastern historical parks. It also covered the salary and travel for a museum expert. Bryant acted promptly to have Russell called to Washington on detail to get the work started. His arrival began a new phase in Park Service curatorial endeavor.

NOTES

1. Letter, Ralph H. Lewis to Carl P. Russell, Sept. 10, 1949, Yavapai folder, Correspondence Files, Grand Canyon National Park.
2. Henry R. Rowland, "Chauncey J. Hamlin," *Hobbies* 10, no. 1 (July 1929): 1-3; George F. Goodyear, "Chauncey Jerome Hamlin," *Science on the March* 44, no. 2 (December 1963): 23-24.
3. U.S. Department of the Interior, *Report of the Director of the National Park Service to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1920* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1920), p. 50. Hereinafter cited as *Report of the Director for (year)*.
4. *Hobbies* 2, no. 3 (July 1921): back page; *ibid.* 2, no. 8 (January 1922): 3-16; *ibid.* 3, no. 2 (July 1922): 9; Francis P. Farquhar, "First Ascent of the Middle Palisade," *Sierra Club Bulletin* 11 (1922): 270.
5. Lewis to Russell, Sept. 10, 1949; letter, Hall to Farquhar, Oct. 25, 1926, folder 362, box 70, Carl P. Russell Papers, Washington State University Library.
6. *Report of the Director for 1924*, p. 8.
7. Hall to Farquhar, Oct. 25, 1926.
8. Hermon Carey Bumpus, Jr., *Hermon Carey Bumpus, Yankee Naturalist* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1947), pp. 3-53.

9. Ibid., pp. 69-70.
10. Hall to Farquhar, Oct. 25, 1926.
11. Bumpus, *Hermon Carey Bumpus*, p. 103.
12. Hall to Farquhar, Oct. 25, 1916.
13. Ibid.; Carl P. Russell's diary, Russell Papers.
14. Bumpus, *Hermon Carey Bumpus*, p. 104.
15. Quoted in Russell note, folder 504, box 79, Russell Papers.
16. *Hobbies* 7, no. 3 (July 1926): 8; *Yosemite Nature Notes* 5, no. 7 (July 31, 1926): 53; *ibid.* 5, no. 12 (Dec. 31, 1926): 89-91; *ibid.* 6, no. 4 (Apr. 30, 1927): 30.
17. Biographical sketch, Yosemite National Park Library Separates, 921.2R; quotation from letter, Russell to C. Frank Brockman, Dec. 5, 1945, Yosemite National Park Library Separates 921.22p-7.
18. Letters, Russell to Harold C. Bryant, Oct. 2 and Dec. 6, 1923, folder 362, box 70, Russell Papers; *Yosemite Nature Notes* 3, no. 3 (Mar. 31, 1924): 2; *ibid.* 3, no. 6 (June 7, 1924): 2.
19. Carl P. Russell, "H. C. Bumpus Inspects the Yosemite Educational Project," *Yosemite Nature Notes* 7, no. 3 (March 1928): 20-23.
20. Hall to Farquhar, Oct. 25, 1926. The change in executive agents resulted in part from Bumpus's dissatisfaction with some aspects of Hall's performance in that capacity; see letter, Francis P. Farquhar to Chauncey J. Hamlin, Mar. 25, 1926, Exhibit History before 1936 box, NPS History Collection.
21. Frank E. Lutz, *Nature Trails* (New York: American Museum of Natural History, Miscellaneous Publications 21, 1926); William H. Carr, *Ten Years of Nature Trailing* (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1937), p. 6.
22. Carr, *Ten Years of Nature Trailing*.
23. Memorandum, Chief, Division of Interpretation, to All Field Offices, Aug. 21, 1957, Planning box, NPS History Collection.
24. Merriam, *Published Papers and Addresses of John Campbell Merriam* (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1938) 4: 2198-2211; Merriam remarks Aug. 6, 1932, Yavapai Museum folder, Correspondence Files, Grand Canyon National Park.
25. *Published Papers of Merriam*.
26. Jesse L. Nusbaum, *Annual Report of the Consulting Archeologist* (Washington: Department of the Interior, 1931), p. 3; letter, Merriam to Minor R. Tillotson, June 18, 1929, Yavapai

Museum folder, Correspondence Files, Grand Canyon National Park; Lewis to Russell, Sept. 10, 1949.

27. Letter, McKee to Merriam, Nov. 9, 1931, Yavapai Museum folder, Correspondence Files, Grand Canyon National Park.

28. Letter, Bumpus to Russell, Apr. 18, 1928, folder 362, box 70, Russell Papers; Russell Diary, Oct. 2, 1928, red folder, Russell Museum Planning 1928-33 box, Richard W. Russell Personal Files.

29. Russell Diary, Nov. 15 and Dec. 17, 1928.

30. Merriam et al., "Individual Reports of the Committee on Educational Problems in National Parks," pp. 11-12, History of Interpretation to 1935 box, NPS History Collection.

31. Merriam et al., *Reports with Recommendations from the Committee on Study of Educational Problems in National Parks, January 9, 1929, and November 27, 1929* (Washington: Department of the Interior, n.d.), p. 3.

32. Maier, "Building a Maya City in Buffalo," *Hobbies* 9, no. 10 (June 1929): 333-41, 352.

33. Russell Diary, Nov. 1-14, 1928.

34. Ibid., Nov. 15, 16, 18, 21-30, Dec. 1-2, 1928.

35. Ibid., Dec. 5-12, 1928.

36. Ibid., Dec. 13, 15-18, 1928.

37. Merriam et al., "Individual Reports of the Committee on Educational Problems in National Parks," p. 12.

38. *Report of the Director for 1930*, p. 190.

39. Russell, Report of Field Naturalist-Museum Advisor for July 1929, Richard W. Russell Personal Files; letters, Russell to Betty Russell, July 7, 11, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 31, 1929, *ibid.*; *Report of the Director for 1929*, p. 16.

40. Russell, Reports of Field Naturalist-Museum Advisor for August-September 1929; letters, Russell to Betty Russell, July 25 and 31, 1929.

41. Letter to Betty Russell, Jan. 23, 1930.

42. Letters, Russell to Betty Russell, Jan. 5, 18, 22, 26, Mar. 26, 27, 1930.

43. Russell, Reports of Field Naturalist-Museum Advisor for April and July 1930.

44. Russell, Reports of Field Naturalist-Museum Advisor for April and September 1930.

45. Russell, Reports of Field Naturalist-Museum Advisor for April-November 1930.

46. Russell, Reports of Field Naturalist-Museum Advisor for June-August 1931.
47. Draft letter, Russell to Robert C. Wheeler, Apr. 9, 1963, folder 568, box 94, Russell Papers.
48. Laurence Vail Coleman, *The Museum in America* (Washington: American Association of Museums, 1939) 2: 265: "This method of display has its values and its dangers. It is thoughtful and awake. It can narrate—which is an important point for history museums. But it falls easily into making what is little more than an illustrated book—big and cumbersome and looking like an exhibit, but really a book all the same. This practice can lead on to indoctrination. It gets away from what museums are for—to give evidence, primarily."
49. Russell, "The Rocky Mountain Museum: A Report," September 1931, Richard W. Russell Personal Files.
50. Letter, Russell to Betty Russell, July 9, 1933.
51. Hall, "Some Suggestions for the Organization of the Educational Department, U.S. National Park Service," Jan. 19, 1925, Philosophy of Interpretation 1917-47 folder, History of Interpretation to 1935 box, NPS History Collection.
52. *Report of the Director for 1925*, p. 136.
53. Hall, "Some Suggestions for the Organization of the Educational Department," p. 7.
54. Letter, Horace M. Albright to Arno B. Cammerer, July 15, 1927, Philosophy of Interpretation 1917-47 folder, History of Interpretation to 1935 box, NPS History Collection.
55. *Report of the Director for 1931*, p. 134; letter, Betty Russell to Russell, May 10, 1933.
56. "General Plan of Administration for the Educational Division," Philosophy of Interpretation 1917-47 folder, History of Interpretation to 1935 box, NPS History Collection. The plan did not mention museological expertise as required of the field naturalists proposed to assist the chief naturalist.
57. "Proceedings of the First Park Naturalists' Training Conference Held at Educational Headquarters, Berkeley, California, November 1 to 30, 1929," Interpretive Conferences 1929-58 box, NPS History Collection; Coleman, *Manual for Small Museums* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927).
58. Report of Field Naturalist-Museum Advisor for August 1930.
59. Reports of Field Naturalist-Museum Advisor for November 1930 and October 1931.
60. Letters Russell to Betty Russell, Mar. 3, 6, 10, 22, 1932, Apr. 19, 30, 1933, Russell Museum Planning 1928-33 box, Richard W. Russell Personal Files.
61. Letters, Russell to Betty Russell, July 17, 19, 1933, *ibid.*

62. Hall, "Report on the Development of Yavapai Station, Grand Canyon National Park, June 1930 to January 1931," Grand Canyon National Park Library; *Report of the Director for 1931*, p. II. Hall's change of title from chief naturalist followed his placement under the Branch of Research and Education in the Washington Office. During 1930 and 1931 Hall's relationship to Merriam paralleled that of Russell to Bumpus. Because Bumpus and Merriam were then at odds over specifics of park educational development, their disagreements threatened to affect the relationships between Hall and Russell, who was his subordinate. Russell wrote his wife on February 24, 1931: "Hall is to work with Merriam on museum projects. Things are rather tense and it is evident that Bumpus is incensed with Merriam and Atwood." She replied: "How can both of you work on museum work? And how can two organizations build museums in the parks without coming to blows?" (Letters in Russell Museum Planning 1928-33 box, Richard W. Russell Personal Files.) Merriam's resignation from the Educational Advisory Board in 1931 and his replacement as chairman by Bumpus defused the immediate situation.

63. Russell Diary, Richard W. Russell Personal Files.

64. Conrad L. Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), pp. 65-127.

65. Hall, "Summary of Activities, Field Division of Education, Berkeley, California, from July 1933 to March 1935," pp. 13, 19, Annual Reports, Branch of Interpretation box, NPS History Collection; "Progress in Research and Education" (draft material for 1934 annual report), *ibid.*

66. The western projects were for Aztec Ruins, Devils Tower, Scotts Bluff, and Tumacacori national monuments (the latter included later) and Hot Springs National Park; the eastern ones were for Chickamauga and Chattanooga, Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial, Guilford Courthouse, Shiloh, and Vicksburg national military parks and Morristown National Historical Park.

67. U.S. Department of the Interior, *Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, 1934* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1934), pp. 165-67; Hall, "Summary of Activities, Field Division of Education," pp. 11, 14, 16.

68. Memorandum, Russell to Hall, Oct. 23, 1933, Philosophy of Interpretation 1917-47 folder, History of Interpretation to 1935 box, NPS History Collection; Russell Diary; *Park Service Bulletin* 3, no. 8 (December 1933): 18.

69. Office Order No. 265, Mar. 15, 1934, Museum Policy binder, NPS History Collection.

70. Letter, Russell to Betty Russell, Feb. 20, 1934, Richard W. Russell Personal Files; Russell Diary, Feb. 19, 1934.

71. Letter, Russell to Betty Russell, Feb. 23, 1934, Richard W. Russell Personal Files; Russell Diary, Feb. 24, 1934.

72. Letter, Russell to Betty Russell, Feb. 26, 1934, Richard W. Russell Personal Files.

73. Letter, Russell to Betty Russell, Mar. 2, 1934, *ibid.*

74. Letter, Russell to Betty Russell, Mar. 3, 1934, *ibid.*

75. Russell Diary, Mar. 5, 1934; memorandum, Bryant to Cammerer, Mar. 5, 1934, 1934 Museums folder, Annual Reports, Branch of Interpretation box, NPS History Collection.

76. Russell Diary, Mar. 6-9, 1934.

77. Memorandum, unsigned but probably from Hillory A. Tolson to Bryant, Dec. 19, 1934, 1934 Museums folder, Annual Reports, Branch of Interpretation box, NPS History Collection.